emanating from the East. We can well understand, therefore, how it is that there are those who believe that the focus of civilisation is destined to undergo another shift, and that the day of the predominance of North-Western Europe is drawing to a close.

The subject is not one which can be discussed here. But if I may sum up briefly the points I have been trying to make, I would say that the human geographer should have before him a twofold purpose. First, he should strive to show that the deductions which the biologists have slowly and painfully laid down in the course of the last sixty years apply, though with an essential difference—which requires careful definition—to the life of man. Secondly, he should use his precise knowledge of the surface of the earth to work out detailed applications of those deductions. In other words, human geography is the biology of man, and, on account of man's vast power of modifying his environment, necessitates a fuller knowledge of that environment than can be required of the biologist in the narrower sense. Investigations along these lines would, I think, promote greatly the interests of geography as a whole, both by making clear to the general public its value and in justifying that intensive study of the surface relief and the associated phenomena which must always remain its basis.

Educational and School Science.[1]

By Sir Richard Gregory.

The Educational Science Section of the British Association, which attains its majority this year, was established to consolidate the claims staked out by workers in different educational provinces, and promote common interest in their development as a whole. As Prof. H. E. Armstrong explained at the opening meeting, it was proposed to devote attention to education in all its branches with the object of introducing scientific conceptions into every sphere of educational activity; that is, conceptions which imply such exact and profitable treatment of a subject as should come from full knowledge. Educational science signifies, however, much more than methods of teaching or the theory of the curriculum. It involves conditions of physical, mental, and moral health, with their manifold types and variations, and the determination of the most appropriate, and therefore most effective, factors of growth at every stage of development. In its present stage educational science must be largely empirical, but in this respect it does not differ from meteorology, for example; and the laws which govern the perpetually varying contents and conditions of a child's mind are not much less precisely known or applied than those by which atmospheric changes are determined.

Education may, therefore, be defined as the deliberate adjustment of a growing human being to its environment; and the scope and character of the subjects of instruction should be determined by this biological principle. What is best for one race or epoch need not be most appropriate for another, but always the aim should be to give the pupil as many points of contact with the world around him as may be profitably developed during his school career. This does not mean, of course, that his vision is to be confined to contemporary necessities or his thoughts to provincial or even national fields. The resources available for his instruction and guidance comprise the wisdom and experience of the past as well as the power of the present, and in their extensive and varied character they now provide teachers with educational opportunities richer and fuller than those of any other period of the world's history. Literature and art form noble domains of the heritage into which the child of to-day is born, but they were mostly planted long ago, and their shapes have not been altered much in modern times. Science has, however, transformed the whole landscape entrusted to it, and the realm of its productivity is continually extending. It is a kingdom potent with possibilities for good or evil—an inheritance which cannot be renounced—and to let any of our children grow up unfamiliar with their entailed possession is to neglect an obvious duty.

The essential mission of school science is thus to prepare pupils for civilised citizenship by revealing to them something of the beauty and the power of the world in which they live, as well as introducing them to the methods by which the boundaries of natural knowledge have been extended and Nature herself is being made subservient to her insurgent son. We live in a different world to-day from that of medieval times, when the *trivium* of grammar, logic, and rhetoric, with the *quadrivium* of arithmetic, geometry, music and astronomy, comprised the subjects of a complete education in the sciences as well as in letters—different indeed from what it was only a century ago. The influence of science is now all-pervading, and is manifest in all aspects of human activity, intellectual and material. Acquaintance with scientific ideas and methods and applications is forced upon every one by existing circumstances of civilised life with its facilities for rapid transport by air, land, or sea, ready communication by telephone or telegraph, and other means by which space and time have been brought under control and man has assumed the mastership of his physical and social destiny. Science permeates the atmosphere in which we live, and those who cannot breathe it are not in biological adjustment with their environment—are not adapted to survive in the modern struggle for existence.

School instruction in science is not, therefore, intended to prepare for vocations, but to equip pupils for life as it is and as it soon may be. It is as essential for intelligent general reading as it is for everyday practical needs; no education can be complete or liberal without some knowledge of its aims, methods, and results, and no pupil in primary or secondary schools should be deprived of the stimulating lessons it affords. In such schools, however, the science to be taught should be science for all, and not for embryonic engineers, chemists, or even biologists; it should be science as part of a general education—unspecialised, therefore, and without reference to prospective occupation or profession, or direct connexion with possible university courses to follow. Less than 3 per cent. of the pupils from our State-aided secondary schools proceed to universities, yet most of the science courses in these schools are based upon syllabuses of the type of university entrance examinations—syllabuses of sections of physics or chemistry, botany, zoology, and so forth—suitable enough as preliminary studies of a professional type to be extended later, but in no sense representing in scope or substance what should be placed before young and receptive minds as the scientific portion of their general education. Such teaching excuses the attitude of many modern Gallios among schoolboys caring "for none of those things." The needs of the many are sacrificed to the interests of the few, with the result that much of the instruction is inept and futile whether judged by standards of enlightenment or of stimulus. Exceptional pupils may profit by it, but to others, and particularly to teachers of literary subjects in the school curriculum, it often appears trivial or sordidly practical, and is usually spiritless—a means by which man may gain the whole world, but will lose his soul in the process.

---

[1] From the presidential address delivered to Section L (Educational Science) of the British Association at Hull on Sept. 7.

This impression is not altogether unjust, and the teaching of recent years has tended to accentuate it. The extent of school science is determined by what can be covered by personal observation and experiment—a principle sound enough in itself for training in scientific method, but altogether unsuitable to define the boundaries of science in general education. Yet it is so used. Every science examination qualifying for the First School Certificate, which now represents subjects normally studied up to about sixteen years of age, is mainly a test of practical acquaintance with facts and principles encountered in particular limited fields, but not a single one affords recognition of a broad and ample course of instruction in science such as is required in addition to laboratory work. I have not the slightest intention or desire to suggest that practical work can be dispensed with in the teaching of any scientific subject, but I do urge that it becomes a fetish when it controls the range of view of the realm of natural knowledge capable of being opened for the best educational ends during school life.

It is now generally recognised by educationists that up to the age of about sixteen years there should be no specialisation in school studies. The First School Examination was organised with this end in view, and seven examining bodies have been approved by the Board of Education to test the results of instruction given in (1) English subjects, (2) languages, (3) mathematics and science, which constitute the three main groups in which candidates are expected to show a reasonable amount of attainment. The number of candidates who presented themselves at examinations of the standard of First School Certificates last year was about 42,000; and of this number, 12,500 took papers in sections of physics, 13,000 in chemistry, 11,400 in botany, 5000 physics and chemistry combined under experimental science, 113 natural history of animals, 31 geology, and 3 zoology.

These numbers may be taken as a fair representation of the science subjects studied in most of our secondary schools, and they suggest that general scientific teaching is almost non-existent. Botany is a common subject in girls' schools, but the instruction in science for boys is limited to parts of physics and chemistry. The former subject is usually divided into mechanics and hydrostatics; heat; sound and light; and electricity and magnetism; and candidates are expected to reach a reasonable standard in two of these sections. They may, therefore, and often do, leave school when their only introduction to science is that represented by the study of mechanics and heat, and without the slightest knowledge of even such a common instrument as an electric bell, while the ever-changing earth around them, and the place of man in it, remain as pages of an unopened book. They ask for bread, and are given a stone. General science covering a wide field is practically unknown as a school subject, and even general physics rarely finds a place in the curriculum because questions set in examinations are, to quote from the Cambridge Locals Regulations, "principally such as will test the candidate's knowledge of the subject as gained from a course of experimental instruction."

One or two examining bodies have introduced general science syllabuses covering the rudiments of physics and chemistry as well as of plant and animal life, but even in these cases most of the subjects must be studied experimentally, and no place is found for any other means of acquiring knowledge. The result is that few schools find it worth while from the point of view of examination successes to attempt to cover such schemes of work. Moreover, no clear principle can be discerned by which the syllabuses are constructed. General science should be more than an amorphous collection of topics from physics and chemistry, with a little natural history thrown in as a sop to biologists. It should provide for good reading as well as for educational observation and experiment; should be humanistic as well as scientific. The subject which above all others has this double aspect is geography; so truly, indeed, is this the case that in the First School Examinations it may be offered in either the English or the Science group. A school course which would cover all the science required for the study of geography conceived as a branch of knowledge concerned with the natural environment of man and the inter-relations between him and those circumstances would not only be educational in the broadest sense, but would also be the best groundwork for effective teaching of geography, history, and other humanistic studies. It would make science a natural part of a vertebrate educational course instead of specialised and exclusive as it tends to be at present.

It cannot be reasonably suggested that the order in which the usual sections of physics are prescribed has any relation to mental growth, or that the topics selected from them are such as appeal to early interests. Few pupils of their own volition wish to determine specific gravities, investigate the laws of motion, calculate specific and latent heats, and so on, at the stage of instruction in science at which these matters are usually studied, and from the point of view of educational value most of them would be more profitably employed in becoming acquainted with as wide a range as possible of common phenomena and everyday things—all considered as qualities to stimulate attention instead of quantities to be measured with an accuracy for which the need cannot be seen and by methods which easily become wearisome. The "Investigators" appointed by the Board of Education in 1918 to report upon the papers set in examinations for the First School Certificate were right when they expressed their opinion "that the early teaching of physics has suffered from too great insistence on more or less exact quantitative work, to the neglect of qualitative or very roughly quantitative experiments illustrating fundamental notions." By the prevailing obsession in regard to quantitative work the pupil is made the slave of the machine, and appliances become encumbrances to the development of the human spirit.

When instruction in science was first introduced into schools its character was determined by insight and conviction rather than by mental needs or interests; so later, when practical work came to be regarded as an essential part of such instruction, its nature and scope represented what certain authorities believed pupils should do, instead of what they were capable of doing with intelligence and purpose. Practical chemistry became drill in the test-tubing operations of qualitative analysis, and the result was so unsatisfactory from the points of view of both science and education that when Prof. Armstrong put forward a scheme of instruction devised by him, in which intelligent experimentation took the place of routine exercises, acknowledgment of its superior educational value could not be withheld, and for thirty years its principles have influenced the greater part of the science teaching in our schools.

Prof. Armstrong's particular contribution to educational science consisted in the production of detailed schemes of work in which these principles were put into practice. Ideas are relatively cheap, and it needs a master mind to make a coherent story or useful structure from them. This was done in the courses in chemistry outlined in Reports presented to the British Association in 1889 and 1890, and the effect was a complete change in the methods of teaching that subject. "The great mistake," said Prof. Armstrong, "that has been made hitherto is that of attempting to teach the elements of this or that special branch of science; what we should seek to do is to impart the elements of scientific method and inculcate wisdom, so choosing the material studied as to develop an intelligent appreciation of what is going on in the world." One feature of heuristic instruction emphasised by its modern advocate, but often neglected, is that which it presents to the teaching of English. Accounts of experiments had to be written out in literary form describing the purpose of the inquiry and the bearing of the results upon the questions raised, and wide reading of original works was encouraged. A few years ago English composition was regarded as a thing apart from written work in science, but this should not be so, and most teachers would now agree with the view expressed by Sir J. J. Thomson's Committee on the Position of Natural Science in the Educational System of Great Britain that "all through the science course the greatest care should be taken to insist on the accurate use of the English language, and the longer the time given to science the greater becomes the responsibility of the teacher in this matter. . . . The conventional jargon of laboratories, which is far too common in much that is written on pure and applied science, is quite out of place in schools."

When heuristic methods are followed in the spirit in which they were conceived, namely, that of arousing interest in common occurrences, and leading pupils to follow clues as to their cause, as a detective unravels a mystery, there is no doubt as to their success. No one supposes that pupils must find out everything for themselves by practical inquiry, but they can be trained to bring intelligent thought upon simple facts and phenomena, and to devise experiments to test their own explanations of what they themselves have observed. It is impossible, however, to be true to heuristic methods in the teaching of science and at the same time pay addresses to a syllabus. A single question raised by a pupil may take a term or a year to arrive at a reasonable answer, and the time may be well spent in forming habits of independent thinking about evidence obtained at first-hand, but the work cannot also embrace a prescribed range of scientific topics. Yet under existing conditions, in which examinations are used to test attainments, this double duty has to be attempted by even the most enlightened and progressive teachers of school science. There can, indeed, be no profitable training in research methods in school laboratories under the shadow of examination syllabuses. Where there is freedom from such restraint, and individual pupils can be permitted to proceed at their own speeds in inquiries initiated on their own motives, success is assured, but in few schools are such conditions practicable; so that, in the main, strict adherence to the heuristic method is a policy of perfection which may be aimed at but is rarely reached.

A necessary condition of the research method of teaching science is that the pupils themselves must consider the problems presented to them as worth solving, and not merely laboratory exercises. Moreover, the inquiries undertaken must be such as can lead to clear conclusions when the experimental work is accurately performed. It may be doubted whether the rusting of iron or the study of germination of beans and the growth of seedlings fulfils the first of these conditions, and the common adoption of these subjects of inquiry is due to custom and convenience rather than to recognition of what most pupils consider to be worth their efforts. It needed a Priestley and a Lavoisier to proceed from the rusting of iron to the composition of air and water, and even such an acute investigator as Galileo, though well aware that air has weight, did not understand how this fact explained the working of the common suction pump.

The mission of school science should not, indeed, be only to provide training in scientific method—valuable as this is to every one. Such training does cultivate painstaking and observant habits, and encourages independent and intelligent reasoning, but it cannot be held in these days that any one subject may be used for the general nourishment of faculties which are thereby rendered more capable of assimilating other subjects. Modern psychology, as well as everyday experience, has disposed of this belief. If the doctrine of transfer of power were psychologically sound, then as good a case could be made out for the classical languages as for science, because they also may be taught so as to develop the power of solving problems and of acquiring knowledge at the same time. When, therefore, advocates of particular courses of instruction state that they do not pretend to teach science, but are concerned solely with method, they show unwise indifference to what is known about educational values. Locke's disciplinary theory—that the process of learning trains faculties for use in any fields, and that the nature of the subject is of little consequence—can no longer be entertained. It has now to be acknowledged that information obtained in the years of school life is as important as the process of obtaining it; that, in other words, subject matter as well as the doctrine of formal discipline must be taken into consideration in designing courses of scientific instruction which will conform to the best educational principles.

So long ago as 1867 the distinction between subject and method was clearly stated by a Committee of the British Association, which included among its members Prof. Huxley, Prof. Tyndall, and Canon Wilson. It was pointed out that general literary acquaintance with scientific things in actual life, and knowledge relating to common facts and phenomena of Nature, were as desirable as the habits of mind aimed at in scientific training through "experimental physics, elementary chemistry, and botany." The subjects which the Committee recommended for scientific information, as distinguished from training, comprehended "a general description of the solar system; of the form and physical geography of the earth, and such natural phenomena as tides, currents, winds, and the causes that influence climate; of the broad facts of geology; of elementary natural history with especial reference to the useful plants and animals; and of the rudiments of physiology." If we add to this outline a few suitable topics illustrating applications of science to everyday life, we have a course of instruction much more suitable for all pupils as a part of their general education than what is now commonly followed in secondary schools. It will be a course which will excite wonder and stimulate the imagination, will promote active interest in the beauty and order of Nature, and the extension of the Kingdom of Man, and provide guidance in the laws of healthy life.

The purpose of this kind of instruction is, of course, altogether different from that of practical experiment in the laboratory. One of the functions is to provide pupils with a knowledge of the nature of everyday phenomena and applications of science, and of the meaning of scientific words in common use. Instead of aiming at creating appreciation of scientific method by an intensive study of a narrow field, a wide range of subjects should be presented in order to give extensive views which cannot possibly be obtained through experimental work alone. The object is indeed almost as much literary as scientific, and the early lessons necessary for its attainment ought to be within the capacity of every qualified teacher of English. Without acquaintance with the common vocabulary of natural science a large and increasing body of current literature is unintelligible, and there are classical scientific works which are just as worthy of study in both style and substance as many of the English texts prescribed for use in schools. We all now accept the view that science students should be taught to express themselves in good English, but little is heard of the equal necessity for students of the English language to possess even an elementary knowledge of the ideas and terminology of everyday science, which are vital elements in the modern world, and it is the business of literature to present and interpret them.

It may be urged that knowledge obtained through descriptive lessons has no scientific reality unless it is derived from first-hand experience, and this is no doubt right in one sense; yet it is well to remember that science, like art, is long, while school life is short, and that though practical familiarity with scientific things must be limited, much pleasure and profit can be derived from becoming acquainted with what others have seen or thought. It is true that we learn from personal experience, but a wise man learns also from the experience of others, and one purpose of a descriptive science course should be to cultivate this capacity of understanding what others have described. As in art, or in music, or in literature, the intention of school teaching should be mainly to promote appreciation of what is best in them rather than to train artists, musicians, or men of letters, so in science the most appropriate instruction for a class as an entity must be that which expands the vision and creates a spirit of reverence for Nature and the power of man, and not that which aims solely at training scientific investigators.

The Royal Botanic Gardens, Kew.

THE area occupied by the Royal Botanic Gardens of Kew, as we know them to-day, is mainly the result of the union of two demesnes, both of them famous in a horticultural sense long before they came to be associated in particular with the science of botany. These two demesnes were, first, the grounds originally attached to a house in the Old Deer Park of Richmond known as Ormonde Lodge, Richmond Lodge, and finally, when it came to be occupied by George II. (then Prince of Wales) about 1721, as Richmond Palace; secondly, the grounds belonging to Kew House or White House, a dwelling that stood near the present Kew Palace, and which, after being occupied by the families of Bennett, Capel, and Molyneux, came into the possession of Frederick, Prince of Wales, in 1730. On the death of George II. in 1760, both properties came under the ownership of his grandson, George III. At that time they were divided by an ancient bridle-path known as "Love Lane," which ran from Richmond Green to a horse-ferry over the Thames at Brentford. George III. obtained Parliamentary sanction to close Love Lane, with the obliteration of which, in 1802, Richmond Gardens and Kew Gardens became the larger Kew Gardens we know at the present time.

In the aero-photograph here reproduced we are looking almost due north, and most of the area shown belongs to the Kew Gardens of the eighteenth century. It is bounded on the east by the Kew Road, some of the villas of which are shown towards the top right-hand